

Appl. No. 09/802,291  
Amdt. dated April 7, 2004  
Reply to Office Action of January 29, 2004

PATENT

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Amendments

The specification is amended to correct several oversights that are grammatical, clerical or typographical in nature. Additionally, the claims are modified in the amendment. More specifically, claims 1, 3, 5, 12, 15, and 17 have been amended and claim 7 has been cancelled. Therefore, claims 1-6 and 8-20 are present for examination. No new matter is added by these amendments. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application as amended.

35 U.S.C. §112 Rejection and Claim Objections

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter. In the interest of quickly furthering prosecution, claim 7 is canceled.

Typos were uncovered by the Examiner in relation to claims 3, 5 and 15. Those claims are amended in the manner suggested by the Examiner.

35 U.S.C. §102 & 103 Rejections

The Office Action has rejected claims 1, 3, 5-9, 11-12, 14, 16-17 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by the cited portions of the Alpha Architecture Handbook (hereinafter the "Handbook"). Further, the Office Action has rejected claims 2, 4, 10, 15 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Handbook in view of the cited portions of U.S. Patent No. 4,833,599 to Colwell et al. (hereinafter "Colwell"). Further still, the Office Action has rejected claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Handbook.

The amended claims require that two mathematical relationships be determined in a single compare instruction. In stark contrast, the Handbook has four instructions to test for four mathematical relationships, where each instruction tests for a single mathematical relationship. The claimed invention can test for these relationships with a fraction of the instructions to be at least twice as efficient on an instruction-by-instruction basis. For at least this reason, reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Appl. No. 09/802,291  
Amdt. dated April 7, 2004  
Reply to Office Action of January 29, 2004


PATENT

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 303-571-4000.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Thomas D. Franklin  
Reg. No. 43,616

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP  
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor  
San Francisco, California 94111-3834  
Tel: 303-571-4000  
Fax: 415-576-0300  
TDF:cmb  
60137653 v1